

The following specimens were exhibited:—

By B. B. Woodward (on behalf of Raymond H. Chandler): Holocene shells from a pipe in the Chalk at Walton Heath. Some eighteen species were shown, including the shells of *Limax maximus* and *Vitrea Rogersi*.

By G. B. Pritchard: Older Tertiary shells from Victoria, comprising examples of Cephalopods, Gastropods, and Peleceypods.

By F. G. Bridgman: Varieties of *Olivella oryza*, Lamk. Attention was particularly drawn to a small white variety (not figured by Duclos or Reeve) used by the natives of the West Indies in the construction of shell-baskets. An exceedingly beautiful example of this work was shown; also specimens of *Olivia intertincta*, Cpr., *O. punctata*, Marrat, and *O. nitidula*, Duclos.

By E. R. Sykes: Types of shells lately described by him from the Indo-Malayan region; also a malformed specimen of the common cockle (*Cardium edule*).

NOTES.

A CORRECTION IN NOMENCLATURE. (*Read 9th December, 1904.*)—In the Proc. Malac. Soc., vol. v, p. 345, a note was published by Messrs. G. B. Sowerby & H. C. Fulton upon “a specimen of *Fistulana clava*, Lamk., perforating a shell of *Mitra interilirata*, Reeve.” This very interesting object having been acquired by the British Museum, it became necessary to prepare a label for exhibition, and it was found that neither the name of the bivalve nor of the *Mitra* appeared to be quite correct, but that they should respectively be *Fistulana mumia* (Spengler), and *Mitra circulata*, Kiener, var.

It is a most difficult and complicated question as to which generic name should be employed for the bivalve, but after considerable investigation I am inclined to adopt *Fistulana*,¹ Bruguière (1789), for this shell, in agreement with Dr. Paul Fischer, who has discussed this point at some length in the Journ. de Conch., 1866, pp. 322–326. One important reference he overlooked at the time, namely, Lamarck’s “Prodrome d’une nouvelle classification des Coquilles” in the Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris, an. vii (1799). On p. 90 he gave a brief diagnosis of *Fistulana*, and quoted but one species, namely, *F. clava*. In this Prodrome, however, he made no reference to *Gastrochaena* or the species (*cuneiformis*, *mytiloides*, and *modiolina*) which he subsequently, in 1818 (Anim. sans Vert., vol. v, p. 447), placed in it. Fischer, in his Man. de Conch., p. 1130, observes that Lamarck limited *Fistulana* in an exact manner in 1799, showing that he had subsequently referred to Lamarck’s Prodrome, which appears to have escaped his attention previously. With regard to the specific name, that given by Spengler (*mumia*) has undoubted priority over Lamarck’s *clava*.

¹ *Fistulana*, Fabricius (1780), is evidently merely a misprint of *Fistularia*, Müller (1776).

A careful examination of the *Mitra* shows that it is certainly distinct from *M. interlirata*, and that it possesses all the features of *M. circulata* of Kiener. The distant spirals and the intervening sculpture are precisely similar, and the number of the columellar folds is the same, namely, three and a very faint anterior fourth, whilst in *interlirata* there are five with the indication of a sixth.

As this remarkable instance of boring is likely to be referred to in future works, it seemed to me advisable to make the above corrections as soon as possible.

E. A. SMITH.

NOTE ON THE DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE VARIOUS PARTS OF MOQUIN-TANDON'S "HISTOIRE NATURELLE DES MOLLUSQUES TERRESTRES ET FLUVIATILES DE FRANCE." (*Read 9th December, 1904.*)—In the Proceedings of the Malacological Society, vol. v, p. 261, Mr. B. B. Woodward, on the authority of the "Bibliographie de la France," gives the dates upon which the various component parts of this important work were published. The particulars there given would appear to be inaccurate, as MM. Letourneux & Bourguignat (*Prodr. Malac. Tunisie, 1887, p. 1*, note), who investigated the subject, give earlier dates for every individual part. According to these authors the true dates of publication were:—

Livr. I,	issued	April 12th,	1855.
" II	"	May 4th,	1855.
" III	"	August 1st,	1855.
" IV	"	September 10th,	1855.
" V	"	January 2nd,	1856.
" VI	"	April 9th,	1856.

J. W. TAYLOR.

NOTE ON *GEITODORIS PLANATA* (ALDER & HANCOCK). (*Read 13th January, 1905.*)—Since I wrote my paper in this journal (vol. vi, p. 180) to prove that Alder & Hancock's *Doris planata* should bear this name, my attention has been called to the account of the species in Jeffrey's British Conchology, vol. v, p. 85, written by Alder, as stated on p. 27. It says: "The examination of further specimens of different sizes, from the Clyde district, proves that the *D. planata* of the 'British Nudibranchiate Mollusca' is the young of *D. testudinaria*. In its young state it is extremely flat, and the gills imperfectly developed." Alder's authority on such a point must naturally carry great weight, but it is noticeable that, whereas he says he had seen further specimens from the Clyde, he does not say that he had seen any from the Mediterranean, and merely refers to Risso (*Hist. Nat. l'Eur. MÉR., vol. iv, p. 33, fig. 15*). It is therefore probable that he identified the specimens with *D. testudinaria* merely on the strength of Risso's description, and, if that is so, I do not think the identification can be considered certain, for he can have had no means of comparing the buccal parts, of which Risso makes no mention. But these organs, which are clearly referred to by Alder & Hancock (*Brit. Nud. Moll., pt. vii, p. 42*), are the most important characters of *D. planata*, and distinguish it from all other recorded British forms. Until it is shown that the *D. testudinaria* of the Mediterranean possesses them, I think the specific name *planata* should be maintained for the British form, and the genus seems to me undoubtedly *Geitodoris*. Risso's *D. testudinaria* has been identified by Bergh and others with *Platydoris argo*, but this identification also is not certain, as Risso's description and figure are unsatisfactory and inadequate. The external characters are not in any way remarkable, and might apply to many Dorids, except that the animal is described and depicted as having